Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/690,367	TAYLOR, BILLY P.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Matthew J. Ludwig	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 September 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *8-12, 20-24 and 32-48* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *8-12, 20-24 and 32-48* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the Amendment received on April 4, 2005.

2.   The rejection of Claims 8-12, 20-24, 32-48 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Hennings have been withdrawn as necessitated by applicant's amendment.

3.   Claims 8-12, 20-24, and 32-48 are pending in the application. Claims 11, 23, and 35, are

independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5.   **Claims 8-12, 20-24, 32-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over Hennings et al., USPN 6,763,496 filed (3/31/99) in view of Robertson et al., USPN

6,486,895 filed (9/8/1995).

In reference to independent claim 11, Hennings teaches:

A web server program to provide access to the documents. A web server program is a

computer program that allows a computer on the network to make documents available to the

rest of the WWW or a private network. The documents are often hypertext documents in the

HTML language, but may be other types of document objects as well, and may include images,

audio, and/or video information. The information that is managed by the Web server includes

hypertext documents that are stored on the server (compare to *"storing a first version of a*

paper"). See column 4, lines 54-67. The reference utilizes a web server for storing various kinds

of documents. Because HTML documents were known at the time the invention was made, to

provide users with versions of papers, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art to provide a web server to store various document objects and offer a user the added benefit

of having multiple types of documents with contextual information to help the user to decide

whether to visit the linked document.

Internet web browsers translate the HTML content of web page documents in order to

display web pages. The HTML document contains a variety of markup and tag elements that are

retrieved and interpreted by the web browser, resulting in a display page (compare to

"translating the first version into a second version of the paper, the second version being

displayable on a display device as a likeness of the paper"). See column 11, lines 10-20.

The data promotion engine parses through the content of the design page document in

search of category_bot entries. When the data promotion engine comes to a "category_bot"

entry, it parses through the contextual information files on the site to identify any documents that

are assigned to a category matching the category indicated by the catergory_bot entry (compare

to *"in response to content within the first version, detecting a reference by the content at a first*

location within the paper, the detected reference being associated with a second location"). See

column 17, lines 1-15.

The data promotion engine then generates the HTML code to insert hyperlinks into the

pages that have been assigned to the matching category (compare to *"forming a link within the*

second version between the first location and the second location, and the first..."). See

column 17, lines 1-24. The reference fails to explicitly state the link being embedded within the

first location, which is a newly added limitation. However, Robertson teaches a book metaphor

which enables a user to browse through a list of web pages. The web pages contain links at

specific locations (as presently claimed, 'first location', fails to preclude the examiner from

utilizing any part of a web page as a first location). Page objects for each web page are

generated. A page object is the internal representation of a web page for use in the book

metaphor. All relative links that originate from a particular home page are collected. The major

difference is the inclusion of a content part. The content part contains various line oriented

information about the content of the page including the HTML specification, the spatial location

of each of the lines, scaling information, and information about selectable regions (links). The

reference discloses links being embedded in a webbook that is dynamic and changes as the book

changes. The links point to internal pages within the book or external locations. See column 5,

lines 50-56, column 7, lines 13-36, and column 8, lines 31-49. It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Hennings and Robertson before him at the

time the invention was made, to modify the contextual link information taught by Hennings to

include the graphical control information embedded in the webbook, because it would have

given the author a proficient method to render the page content consistent with the HTML

specification.

In reference to dependent claim 8, Hennings teaches:

Hypertext links correspond to the parent documents of rhino.htm file and hippo.hym file

respectively. A similar set of hypertext links are created that correspond to category list

components. See column 17, 25-35.

In reference to dependent claim 9, Hennings teaches:

The browser contains JAVA script for displaying the design page on a browser. The

data promotion engine is invoked to generate hyperlinks that correspond to each of the category

list components in a given design page. See column 17, lines 1-13.

In reference to dependent claim 10, Hennings teaches:

Hypertext links correspond to the parent documents of rhino.htm file and hippo.hym file

respectively. A similar set of hypertext links are also created that correspond to category list

components. See column 17, 25-35.

In reference to dependent claim 37, 41, and 45, Hennings teaches:

Hypertext links correspond to the parent documents of rhino.htm file and hippo.hym file

respectively. A similar set of hypertext links are created that correspond to category list

components. See column 17, 25-35.

In reference to dependent claim 38, 42, and 46, and Hennings teaches:

A web server program to provide access to the documents. A web server program is a

computer program that allows a computer on the network to make documents available to the

rest of the WWW or a private network. The documents are often hypertext documents in the

HTML language, but may be other types of document objects as well, and may include images,

audio, and/or video information. The information that is managed by the Web server includes

hypertext documents that are stored on the server. See column 4, lines 54-67.

In reference to dependent claim 39, 43, and 47, Hennings teaches:

A web server program to provide access to the documents. A web server program is a

computer program that allows a computer on the network to make documents available to the

rest of the WWW or a private network. The documents are often hypertext documents in the

HTML language, but may be other types of document objects as well, and may include images,

audio, and/or video information. The information that is managed by the Web server includes

hypertext documents that are stored on the server. See column 4, lines 54-67.

In reference to dependent claim 40, 44, and 48, Hennings teaches:

Internet web browsers translate the HTML content of web page documents in order to

display web pages. The HTML document contains a variety of markup and tag elements that are

retrieved and interpreted by the web browser, resulting in a display page. See column 11, lines

10-20.

In reference to dependent claim 12, Hennings teaches:

The data promotion engine keeps a record of the locations of the parent documents (the

document to which the contextual information file corresponds). See column 17, lines 15-24.

In reference to claims 20-24, the claims reflect the system comprising computer readable

instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in 8-12, respectively, and therefore are

rejected under similar rationale.

In reference to claims 32-36, the claims reflect the computer program product comprising

computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in 8-12, respectively,

and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8-12, 20-24, 32-48 have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant added the newly formed limitations into the independent claim, which change

the scope of the claim when read as a whole. More specifically, the claim language, 'the link

being embedded within the first location', is argued by the applicant, as not being taught by

Hennings. The rejection has been modified and the Robertson reference added to illustrate the

use of a webbook, and more importantly, the utilization of links embedded within a webbook.

The embedded links point to internal and external locations and is used to render the page

content consistent with the HTML specification. See column 17, lines 1-15.

The data promotion engine then generates the HTML code to insert hyperlinks into the pages

that have been assigned to the matching category (compare to *"forming a link within the second*

version between the first location and the second location, and the first..."). See column 17,

lines 1-24. The reference fails to explicitly state the link being embedded within the first

location, which is a newly added limitation. However, Robertson teaches a book metaphor which

enables a user to browse through a list of web pages. The web pages contain links at specific

locations (as presently claimed, 'first location', fails to preclude the examiner from utilizing any

part of a web page as a first location). Page objects for each web page are generated. A page

object is the internal representation of a web page for use in the book metaphor. All relative links

that originate from a particular home page are collected. The major difference is the inclusion of

a content part. The content part contains various line oriented information about the content of

the page including the HTML specification, the spatial location of each of the lines, scaling

information, and information about selectable regions (links). The reference discloses links being

embedded in a webbook that is dynamic and changes as the book changes. The links point to

internal pages within the book or external locations. See column 5, lines 50-56, column 7, lines

13-36, and column 8, lines 31-49. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Hennings and Robertson before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the contextual link information taught by Hennings to include the graphical control information embedded in the webbook, because it would have given the author a proficient method to render the page content consistent with the HTML specification.

Conclusion

7.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 571-272-4127. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ML
November 22, 2005

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER